

REMARKS

Substance of Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner and her supervisor for the in-office interview held on February 10, 2004. The participants included Mylihn Tran and Kristine Kincaid of the USPTO and the applicants and applicant's representatives, David Miranda, Frank Occhiuti, Julian Orbanes, and Max Riesenhuber. To ensure a complete and proper recordation of the substance of the interview on, the following remarks are submitted in accordance with MPEP § 713.04.

A) Demonstrations were conducted showing a product that contains some embodiments of the inventions. Cell phones and PDA's were used to show the power of the interface and how it differed from Strasnick.

B) Claim 1 was primarily discussed.

C) Strasnick et al. (USPN 5,671,381).

D) There were no principle proposed amendments. Applicants pointed out differences from Strasnick and the Examiners pointed out whether or not such differences were included in the broadest claims.

E) The general thrust of the arguments was that the prior art of record failed to demonstrate applicant's claimed process where the display screens are included in the same spatial paradigm, so the viewer does not lose context when navigating from one screen to another. The display screen is an expansion or contraction of details of what is currently being displayed.

F) See the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner re other cases also discussed.

G) No agreement was reached.

H) Not applicable to an in-office interview.

Specification-

Applicants have amended the abstract as suggested.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

#### Double Patenting-

Applicants shall file a disclaimer should patentable subject matter be identified.

#### Claim Rejections-

The examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,671,387 to Strasnick et al. ("Strasnick"). Strasnick does not anticipate each and every claim limitation of applicant's invention. Currently amended claim 1 recites enabling said user to navigate display screens that are included as part of the same spatial paradigm, navigating from a first display screen to a second display screen within said spatial paradigm without losing context, wherein said second display screen includes a more detailed view of said first display screen.

In contrast to the applicants' invention, Strasnick does not enable navigation in such a fashion. In Strasnick, FIG. 2B includes the "single cell 275 of interest" and "[h]yperlinks 290 [that] enable a navigator to warp to the hierarchical dependents or children of the cell displayed." [Strasnick, col. 8, lines 39-42] "In warp mode navigation and viewing, a single cell is displayed." [Strasnick, col. 11, lines 22-24] This navigation maintains neither the context nor the spatial paradigm when navigating from one cell to another. For at least these reasons, claims 1, 6, and 16, and all of their dependent claims distinguishes from Strasnick.

The applicant asks that all claims be allowed.

Enclosed is a \$475 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.


**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Applicant : Orbanes et al.  
Serial No. : 09/782,964  
Filed : February 14, 2001  
Page : 11 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 15578-016001

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 5/10/04

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David Miranda  
Reg. No. 42,898

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
225 Franklin Street  
Boston, MA 02110-2804  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

20799910.doc

BEST AVAILABLE COPY